THE ZETETIC

Department of Sociology
Eastern Michigan University
Ypsilanti, Michigan 48197

Published by The Committee for the Scientific Investigation of Claims of the Paranormal

Editor: Marcello Truzzi

Jan. 28, 1977

Dr. Bernard Heuvelmans
Centre de Crytozoologie
Verlhiac/Saint-Chamassy
24260 Le Bugue, France

Dear Dr. Heuvelmans:

Ron Westrum just shared your responding letter with me. I am delighted that you would be willing (although with some reluctance) to review Mackal's book. The end of February should be fine, but if you need more time,we can simply run it in the following issue of THE ZETETIC. So, don't feel rushed, please.

I have not read Mackal's book but had received the impression that it was far better in a scientific sense than your letter suggests. I am now all the more anxious to read your review.

In regard to the word paranormal, I recognize your feelings about the appropriateness of sea serpents in such a category. As you know, I broadly define the term to largely mean unorthodox science, that is, where claims are made that go beyond what science (at least "establishment" science) considers to be "normal." Certainly the claims for a sea serpent (today) would be considered "deviant" claims by most zoologists. I find that this term paranormal, which I originally used thinking it was largely neutral in connotation, is offensive to almost all (the parapsychologists being the exception) adherents to deviant scientific views. Thus, the followers of Velikovsky have written me that they were insulted to be placed under this term, as have been the ufologists, and many others who think of themselves as "normal" scientists. (From my standpoint, these represent proto-scientific perspectives, and I enclose an article on this that might help clarify my views to you.)

If you wish, you might even begin your review with a discussion of whether or not cryptozoology should be considered paranormal at all. And, of course, you can similarly handle some of your other reservations about attacking Mackal by making some of these feelings explicit in your article. There is no space limitation for your review, so take the space you think necessary.

A small aside: Ron tells me that Ivan Sanderson once told you that Sterling Lanier (my good friend who once wrote to you and who edited Sanderson's book for Chilton publishers) was sexually deviant and someone to avoid. That is quite untrue and I hope you and Sterling eventually get into correspondence since he is truly great admirer of

(313) 487-0184

your books. Sanderson seems to have lied about a great many things!

Again, I do hope that you will review the Mackal book. Ron has indicated his willingness to give any editorial help re language problems (though you obviously have full command from English as seen from your letter).

I look forsard to hearing from you directly, and I do hope you will do the review.

Best wishes,

Marcello Truzzi

Verlhiac, January 17, 1977

My dear Ron,

I hope you will forgive this long delay in answering both your letters of [redacted] December 9 and 25. I have been so awfully busy these last weeks and even months preparing and recording TV and Radio programs that I have had to postpone all correspondence. I have just had a TV team here the whole last week and recorded with them 12 five-minutes programs on Fabulous Beasts and their psychological significance. Needless to say I am completely exhausted. How I wish I could have spent the whole winter working quietly on a new book! But I had to accept these TV and Radio jobs for strictly financial reasons.

I will now try and answer your letters seriatim.

– The Zetetic. Thanks very much for the 1st issue of its new series. It is a beauty, it is most interesting, and its pyrrhonic spirit is exactly mine.

Prof. Truzzi wrote to me a very nice letter asking me, as you did yourself, to review Ray Mackal's book The Monster of Loch Ness. I would be quite prepared to do so if I am left with sufficient time, and if you accept yourself to edit it, as I doubt my own literary capacities in English. (I think I will not be able to write and send my review before the end of February. Would this fit the Zetetic editors' time schedule?)

But – and there is more than a "but" – I do not see what a problem like the one of the Loch Ness animals has to do with "claims of the Paranormal". Sightings of animals unknown

to Science may be considered "anomalous" but certainly not "paranormal", unless of course the observer tells that he has seen them crawl out of a flying saucer or being dropped out of one.

Prof. Truzzi broadens the meaning of "paranormal" in his excellent editorial, but I think it is harmful for cryptozoological research to be classified in the same category as phenomena which cannot be explained yet in the light of our present physico-chemical laws. This does not mean of course that I despise or reject research on such phenomena as ESP, UFO's, unorthodox medical practices or astrology. It just deals with another entirely different kind of problems.

My second "but" is this. It is rather embarrassing for a science writer to tear apart another one, especially when he deals with the same subject as him. Mackal's books only arrived here ten days ago and I have not read it entirely. I just went through it and read only two chapters carefully. But I can already state that it is probably the worse books ever written on the subject. The blurb on the covers praises it as "The first complete scientific study", and it is certainly the less complete I have seen, and it is only "scientific" in its outer superficial appearance: it is a jewel of pseudo-science. Using a scientific jargon, putting a lot of statistics and graphics (often quite irrelevant), adding appendices and a bluff bibliography does not make a scientific study. Mackal's book is a perfect example of a certain form of pseudo-science which is not to be found only in books by Von Däniken, Charroux, Pauwels & Bergier, but in most science journals also!

Machal writes (p.12): ... "the published material relating to Loch Ness and its alleged monster, none of it "scientific" in nature, mainly anecdotal." This is not very nice for either Oudemans, Maurice Burton ~~of~~ Heuvelmans, all three professional zoologists, but refers very aptly to Machal's book itself. Moreover the scientific training of a naval engineer like Rupert T. Gould ~~of~~ of an aeronautics engineer as Tim Dinsdale ~~—~~ is certainly on the level of Machal scientific training. And a biochemist is certainly not more competent in zoology than an engineer

(Was he?)

To put it in a nutshell I will have to murder a man with whom I once corresponded very nicely, when he wrote to me for information (which he seems to have completely forgotten by now). And it will be easy afterwards for some people to suggest that I did so because Machal just overlooked ~~—~~ my own research on the matter. But he did so also with Oudemans' works, which he just ignores. As a matter of fact he wants people to believe that He is the first scientist who ever investigated the problem: this is pretentious and ridiculous.

I would like to have your opinion on all this.

And may I ask you to communicate this letter (or a photocopy of it) to Prof. Truggi as I will not have the time right now to write such a lengthy letter to him. Please ask him to excuse my delay in answering his letter: I will do it as soon as possible. But in the meantime I would like ~~him~~ that he would consider my situation in this book review matter.

* *
*

Yes I got the article from Current Anthropology (not the American Anthropology) in good time. Unfortunately

it referred to two other articles published previously. When I tryed to consult them in Paris at the Musée de l'Homme's library, the only one in France, I think, which has Current Anthropology I found out that their collection is incomplete, so I have not been able yet to see PORSHNEV's original article.

– I am including a faithful copy of the Chicago Evening Post article on Prof. Huxley and his opinion on the Sea serpent.

– I will see what I will be able to do about the computer enhancement of my H. longipides photos. For the time being I am completely broke and I doubt that the Musée ~~de~~ de l'Homme would support me financially: I will ask the Brussels Institut royal des Sciences naturelles.

– I do not think I ~~~~ thanked you enough or for all the books you have been so kind as to send: they are invaluable. FitzPatrick's Rafinesque is of great importance for me, and I am looking forward to Call 's book on the subject. Is there a chance of finding a copy of vol. I of White's History of the Warfare of Science with Theology, of which you sent vol. II? A very important reference book!

Do you mean that you have already found copies of both 'Lore of the Unicorn' and Wild Men in the Middle Ages?

I have still not been successful as far as Daudin is concerned. And I have asked the librarian of the Brussels Institute to try and trace the abbé Berthelon's articles in the Journal des Sciences Utiles (the 1790 volume is not to be found in any French library: I hope I will have more luck in Belgium, who knows).

I am leaving Tuesday for Paris, where I will organize a search for NEF, PINTARD and BAYLE. Concerning the latter, as you are only interested in the text, don't you want me to have it xeroxed if I fail to find a copy of the book itself, which is most probable for such an ancient item? (Although I might not get the permission of having such an old book xeroxed

- Re Mangiacopra. Yes, he is a most diligent researcher indeed, but his writing style is abominable, and I have rarely seen such a bad spelling. Why on earth does he not have his newspaper articles xeroxed? (It is possibly prohibited, as in the Bibl. Nat. in Paris). What a waste of time, and moreover the result is unreliable.

- I am delighted to hear that Gauquelin's hypothesis passed victoriously 2[illegible] critical tests. Bravo!

- I understand quite well - more I think could understand it as well as I might now! - that you have not been able yet to read my notice on H. longipides, and the article on Cryptozoology (incidentally, would it not be possible to have a translation of it published in The Zetetic?)

- On the 26th of December last, I sent you (by surface mail) a bundle of issues of an interesting belgian magazine (INFORESPACE) on ufology, and gave you the address of the people you could write to if you want the more recent issues. You will have better use of this mag in your library than in mine.

I have to close now. I hope this year started better for you than for me (I have [illegible] not been in such dramatic financial state for at least 15 years; my publisher whom I liked very much died last week, and I have just had the news that I will not be able next year anymore to rent the bungalow I have had on the island for more than 15 years, and there are probably some minor disasters that I have already forgotten. All the same, as, in spite of my great age - sixty, mind you - I feel tip-top, I think I will survive).

Very best wishes
from your friend

Bernard

Centre de Cryptozoologie
Verlhiac/Saint-Chamassy
24260 LE BUGUE
FRANCE

Verlhiac, February 21, 1977

Dear Prof. Truzzi,

Let me first thank you for your nice letters of both Dec. 31, 1976 and Jan 28, 1977. I hope you have forgiven me for not having answered the former, at least not directly, and that you will now forgive me for answering the latter with some delay. I must say that as far as my work schedule is concerned the situation has aggravated since my last letter to Ron Westrum: having caught a bad cold while doing bibliographical research in Paris, a severe bronchitis forced me to stay in bed for almost a week with very high fever, which prevented almost all work during that time.

All the same, as you tell me in your last letter that you are not in a hurry in re Mackal's book review, I can now consider writing it for the Zetetic. But I must say that now that I have completed reading this fat, dull, badly constructed book I am more and more reluctant to write this review, as there is really nothing nice to say about it.

Roy Mackal, who is a conceited, self-inflated man, wants his readers to believe that before he came, nothing serious has ever been done or written about the unknown animals of Loch Ness, and he even says so (p. 12): "... the published material relating to

loch Ness and its alleged monster, none of it "scientific" in nature, mainly anecdotal." Do you think this is fair or even polite to professional zoologists like Prof. C.A. Oudemans, Dr Malcolm Burr, Dr Maurice Burton and myself?

If, after such a statement, Dr Mackal had given a brilliant demonstration of his own scientific spirit, accuracy and methods his arrogance could perhaps have been justified. But what have we? Half of his book is made up from appendices (obviously to give it a "scientific" appearance), twelve of them! Seven of these (A, C, D, E, F, I & J should have been incorporated in the chapters where they belong, and five (B, G, H, K, L) should have been suppressed as they are only indirectly relevant to the problem.

The first half of the book is made up of three parts.

Part I: the Search is purely anecdotal or unnecessarily technical (What's the use describing at length and in detail one-man submarines which cannot be used in loch Ness due to the poor visibility under water or a whole series of sophisticated devices which have never given any positive results?)

Part II, the Evidence is a good synthesis of everything which has been accumulated in the previous literature (without any credit ever given to it), but the evaluation of the evidence is not better, or not worse, than what had been done before, and is certainly not based on stronger or more rigorous criteria.

Part III, the Analyses, would be very interesting if the author had not been unduly prejudiced in his choice of the "candidates", and if he had given proper credit to the various researchers who long before him proposed the hypotheses that he defends as his own ones. In this perspective he is frankly dishonest. He for instance dismisses very lightly, and for very bad reasons, the Oudemans-Heuvelmans Plesiped hypothesis, but, when he defends what he presents as his

own hypothesis, the Giant Amphibian hypothesis, he simply ignores — and does not even mention in his bibliography — Dr Malcolm Burr who built up a good case for it in 1934.

Moreover most of the zoological information and discussion in this part is just stolen from my Sea-serpent books (I say stolen - not borrowed, since, with one exception (p. 140), he never gives me credit for it).

Frankly it would be difficult for me to review such a book without being insulting. From a practical point of view this would be harmful for the future of scientific research on loch Ness, because there are probably many ignorant people or even unscientific minded scientists who will be impressed by the pseudo-scientific clothing of Mackal's book, and who will at last take the problem more seriously because of it.

What do you think? I will follow your advice.

* *
*

Now let me come back to a point in your last letter, anent the use of the term "paranormal" applied to cryptozoological research. You say for instance: "Certainly the claims for a sea serpent (today) would be considered "deviant" claims by most zoologists." I do not think that this is true, unless "sea serpent" is taken literally from a zoological point of view. All scientific journals without exception have reviewed my Sea-Serpent books very favorably, as well in Europe as in the U.S. Nobody ever suggested that my claims were "deviant" or my science unorthodox. There are not — or there should be no — "deviant" subjects in Science: what is important is the method with which the subject has been tackled.

One cannot even say that sea-serpent sightings are "anomalous". What would be "anomalous" is that there would not exist any large unknown animals in the sea anymore. In my books On the Track of Unknown Animals I have shown that one can calculate on a statistical basis how many new species of fish, amphibians, reptile, birds and mammals are to be discovered every year. It would be "anomalous" not to discover new species anymore during a certain lapse of time.

In your excellent discussion of the definition of the occult, (which I read with great interest and even enthusiasm, because I agree entirely with you on the essentials) I have been shocked to read after your definition of "an anomalous object" (that is "a deviation from the usual, credible order of things"): "e.g., the sighting of an abominable snowman, a levitated fakir floating in the air, or a giant sea serpent." Just give this sentence its proper wording, without using either a ludicrous journalists' name nor a name pertaining to an very ancient myth, and the distinctions to be made will strike you at once. Just listen: "e.g., the sighting of a still unknown giant primate, a levitated fakir floating in the air, or a large unidentified sea-animal, elongated in shape." In the present state of science one cannot explain how a man could float in the air without the help of some helicopter propeller, but there is absolutely nothing abnormal, anomalous or occult in the possible existance of large animals still unknown "officially" to Science in remote or rarely visited areas of the world.

* *
*

Now a last word concerning Sterling Lanier, whom I always liked very much.(*) We once had a very nice talk on the phone and he invited me very friendly to stay awhile with him in Florida, which I accepted enthusiastically. Unfortunately subsequent events (the unfortunate "Iconan" case) changed all my plans by delaying unduly my departure from the States on my way to Central America, and I had to give up my visit to Florida.

It is in the meantime that Ivan Sanderson started a whole disparagement campaign against Sterling. For which reasons I have never been able to discover. But he obviously did not want us to meet, probably because we would, by discussing certain questions at leisure, have uncovered some of Ivan's arrant lies. Ivan manoeuvers were so obvious that I never believed what he said of Sterling, i.a. that he was sexually deviant. (Incidentally, even if I had thought that this was true, it would not have changed anything in my plans. I have excellent friends who are homosexual: that does not make them less interesting from an intellectual or artistic point of view. I am a wild individualist and I know only individuals, whatever their sex, age, colour, religion, race, philosophy, political ideal, financial situation, sexual perversion or zoological category can be.)

When you say that "Sanderson seems to have lied about a great many things!", this is really an understatement, since Ivan lied about <u>everything</u>. He was a pathological liar, at least he had become one when I met him at last, after twelve years of correspondence. I do not know whether

---

(*) The beautiful little copper statuette of the Snowman he once sent me is always on my desk.

he had always been like that (let us not forget that he died a few years later of a tumor in the brain) but he must have had at least a tendency to it. He even admitted once that it is at Cambridge that he learned how to lie properly, and he was very proud of it.

He was quite unable to report any event without distorting systematically all the facts and figures (I have been able to check this several times when we had shared the same experience together). For instance, if we had driven let us say 4.000 miles in 9 days, he reported to everybody that we had driven 5.000 miles in 8 days. Everything had to be exaggerated. A very strange tendency, which I had never met with before in such a systematic form.

* *
*

I am afraid this has been a very lengthy letter, but this conversation by fits and starts may have helped you at least to make a little better acquaintance with me.

Very best wishes,

Dr. B. Heuvelmans

THE ZETETIC

Department of Sociology
Eastern Michigan University
Ypsilanti, Michigan 48197

Published by The Committee for the Scientific Investigation of Claims of the Paranormal

Editor: Marcello Truzzi

Dec. 31, 1976

Dr. Bernard Heuvelmans
Centre de Cryptozoologie
Berlhiac/Saint-Chamasay
24260
Le Bugue, France

Dear Dr. Heuvelmans:

I have long admired your books, and my colleague Ron Westrum recently gave me your address. You may know of our new journal (a copy is enclosed).

I presume you are familiar with Roy P. Mackal's book THE MONSTER OF LOCH NESS. Ron Westrum and I were speaking of it, and I mentioned how very nice it would be if you were willing to write a review of Mackal's book for THE ZETETIC. Ron said he would write you about it. I presume you have heard from Ron, but I thought I would take this opportunity to send you a copy of the journal and personally extend an invitation to you to do such a review for us. I hope doing so might interest you. I regret that the journal does not currently pay for articles and reviews, but we hope that as subscriptions increase such payments might be possible. At present, it is labor-of-love for all of us.

I wonder if you have been contacted by Robert Rines re his searches of Loch Ness and his Canadian search for the sasquatch? I have been unable to elicit a response from him to several letters seeking information.

I also wonder if you might know Sterling Lanier? Sterling first introduced me to your books some years ago. He is a science-fiction writer and naturalist and was an editor at Chilton Book Company in charge of Ivan Sanderson's book on the abominable snowman. Sterling is a consulting editor on THE ZETETIC. I got the impression that the two of you might have corresponded at some point.

I do hope you will be willing to do the review, for there is no one more qualified that I know of. In any case, I do hope you will keep me and the Committee informed about your own advances "in search of unknown animals."

Best wishes,

Marcello Truzzi

(313) 487-0184

THE ZETETIC

Department of Sociology
Eastern Michigan University
Ypsilanti, Michigan 48197

Published by The Committee for the Scientific Investigation of Claims of the Paranormal

Editor: Marcello Truzzi

March 29, 1977

Dear Dr. Heuvelmans:

Forgive my delay in answering your letter of Feb. 21, but I have been swamped this month and my correspondence has suffered.

I very much hope that you will write the review of the Mackal book despite your reservations. I suggest that you simply discuss your feelings in the review itself.

In part prompted by your letter, I have been busy at work on a new typology dealing with deviant sciences. I will probably include some of this in the next issue in my editorial. Since I think you would be interested, let me mention some of it here. First let me mention, however, that I think some of our problems are semantic. By "deviant" in regard to scientific views, I was not making a methodological or empirical judgement, merely indicating that the majority of scientists working in the area (i.e., the orthodoxy or establishment science) did not accept the claims being made. I do not consider your own work even particularly deviant in this regard since I know that your books have been very well received. I also must, upon reflection, agree that the existence of a "sea serpent" is not necessarily an anomaly. It depends upon what one has in mind. A plesiosaur in Loch Ness would surely be an anomaly, an unidentified sea animal elongated in shape in an ocean would probably not be. I think the typology I am working on will help clarify all this.

In brief, we can categorize claims as "ordinary" (they fit with what we know and expect),"anomalous" (they exist and are validated but do not fit with what we know and expected), and "alleged anomalies" (which don't fit and have not been validated anyway). In general, we can differentiate things (variables) and processes (relationships). Both variables and relationships can be categorized as ordinary, anomalous (extraordinary), and alleged anomalies. Putting all this into a matrix, we can categorize the varieties of what I have called proto-sciences (claims being made attempting to conform to scientific canons of proof and validity). Those making claims about anomalous or alleged anomalous variables (things) are best labelled "crypto-sciences." Those making claims about anomalous or alleged anomalous relationships (processes) are best labelled "para-sciences."

Varibales (things)	Relationships (processes/laws): ordinary	anomalous	alleged anomalous
ordinary	normal science	para-science	
anomalous	crypto-science		
alleged anomalous			

(313) 487-0184

Thus, if a person claims an anomalous object (a living dinosaur, a Yeti, a unicorn, etc.), that is a crypto-science claim (in this case cryptozoological). If the relationships claimed are anomalous (telepathy, influence of the planets upon personality, etc.), it is a parascience. But there are claims that are both. Thus, claiming the existence of a mermaid is both crypto and para-science. The claim of the existence of the mermaid itself is merely crypto-, but the implications of such a creature for general biological and evolutionary theory would be so extraordinary that it would mean the need to totally reconstruct our view of species, etc. Obviously, part of our semantic difficulty re "sea serpents" is over this sort of point. If you define the sea serpent as you do, it is purely crypto- and hardly para-, but others define it in ways that are both. Careful examination of the matrix and its implications provides some, I think, very interesting insights (at least to me). For example: A crypto- claim is theoretically easily demonstrated but almost impossible to falsify. (E.g.: all you need is to find one unicorn to show everyone and the case is established; but if you can not find a unicorn, the believer can always claim you have not looked far enough or hard enough.) On the other hand, a para- claim is very difficult to establish and easy to falsify. (E.g.: if you experimentally prove telepathy, one experiment is not enough for you need replication and the elimination of other explanations; but one experiment can falsify the claim for most of us.)

What I find especially interesting is the interrelationship between the crypto- and para- elements in many claims in deviant science. You usually find very different sorts of claims being made within each special category. Thus, there are UFO students who claim purely crypto- status. That is, they allege that something extraordinary is seen in the sky without making many inferences about the origins, etc. But others argue for extraterrestrials which then gets us into all sorts of parascience claims since it would probably involve new laws of nature (if the spaceship went faster than the speed of light, etc.). I should also point out that you have crypto- and para-science forms in every science. Thus, Donnely's claim that Atlantis existed is largely a crypto-geographical claim. The existence of Black Holes is a crypto-astronomical claim, etc.

The other thing worth mentioning here is the lumping together I have made above of the anomalous and alleged anomalous claims. The two are too often lumped thus when the distinction is very important. All sciences recognize some variables and relationships as anomalous and existing. But most of what is called Forteana is merely alleged and often poorly documented and probably false.

Anyway, you can see from the above which way my mind is now running. The whole analysis is much more complicated, but would require too much for this letter. I'll send you a copy of the article when I finish it should you be interested. I'd certainly welcome your comments.

******

Again, back to the Mackal book review. I really think the book needs a competent review, and I can not think of anyone better qualified than yourself. I realize that the review presents some difficulties, but since you won't have to worry about length (space), you should

be able to simply discuss the issues involved in the review itself. And, of course, Mackal may wish to reply to the review. In fact, if you wish, I will be glad (as I just did with a scathing review of Dr. Hynek and Dr. Vallee's book on UFOs) to send an advanced copy of your review to Mackal for his response (to be followed by your rejoinder in the same issue). Would that be better? I would personally prefer that, if Mackal is willing to respond (as Hynek did in the coming issue). If you have other suggestions, I will certainly consider them. You also could, if you really insisted, write under a pseudonym, but I would like to avoid that. But, it seems to me that opening your review with something like "I write this review with some hesitation since...." that would largely take care of the problem and even make for a more interesting review.

I'm delighted, finally, to hear of your continued positive regard for Sterling who is my own very good friend. I have not heard from him in a few months, but Pat (my wife) and I hope he will come to Ann Arbor (where we live) this summer for the big craft fair where I think he could sell many of his excellent statues. He is currently at work on the sequel to his last novel (Heiro's Journey).

I regret that I never met Sanderson since, despite his lying, he seems to have been an extraordinary person.

Best wishes,

Marcello

Marcello Truzzi

Dr Bernard Heuvelmans
CENTRE DE CRYPTOZOOLOGIE
Verlhiac Saint-Chamassy
24260 LE BUGUE (FRANCE)

January 22, 1978

Dear Marcello,

I should have written a long time ago to tell you how sorry I was to hear that you had left the Zetetic Committee, although now that I have seen the last issue of their magazine, I understand why you did so and deeply sympathize with your feelings.

Needless to say I would be delighted to act as a Consulting Editor for your new periodical, the Zetetic Scholar, since its aims and rules are perfectly similar to my own.

Please forgive me if I have to make this a rather short letter, but I am snowed under with work, having a new book to complete, and I have had to give up all correspondance of no urgent nature.

My very best wishes for your new journal, and, incidentally, all my personal greetings for the new year,

Yours sincerely,

B. Heuvelmans

Dr Bernard Heuvelmans
CENTRE DE CRYPTOZOOLOGIE
Verlhiac Saint-Chamassy
24260 LE BUGUE (FRANCE)

February 20, 1978

Dear Professor Tuzzi,

Be reassured, my comments on THE ZETETIC's last issue were referring to the third issue (that is Vol. II, n°1) which has been sent right away to me, probably because of my review of Mackal's books. How could it have been possible otherwise?

Personally I have been particularly shocked by the (of course) anonymous Psychic Vibrations. Scoffing at articles on UFO's, Loch Ness "monsters", Bigfoot, etc. even before they have appeared does not look exactly as a "Scientific Investigation" of claims of the Paranormal. This is why the subtitle 'The Skeptical Inquirer" made me jump out of my shoes. These people do not seem to have the slightest idea of what skepticism is. As the most ignorant journalist they seem to think that "skeptic" is synonymous with "incredulous"...

I once read something quite sensible about what science is: "Science deserves careful, critical scrutiny, like all institutions and activities. But much of the anti-science rhetoric tossed about so easily these days seems to be based on a total misunderstanding of what science is and isn't. It is the antithesis of dogma".

This text comes out of the July 12, 1975 issue of Science News and was written by the editor, a certain Kendrick Frazier. The present editor of the Zetetic should really meet this gentleman, who could advise him usefully. And tell him first of all not to associate with the French Union rationaliste, the most obnoxious bunch of pompous bigots I have ever heard of. Pseudoscientists in all their splendor, even although many of them have a great reputation in science.

* *
*

On the contrary I have been delighted to read the Zetetic scholar's announcement, as I appreciated the original Zetetic up to vol. I. n°2 included.

I do hope I will find the time in a near future (that is in a couple of months) to complete the article on Cryptozoology I started to write for your journal.

With very best wishes,

Sincerely,

[signature]

Verlhiac / Saint-Chamassy
24260 LE BUGUE / FRANCE

April 25, 1977.

Dear Prof. Truzzi,

Please forgive this slight (for me) delay in answering your letter of March 29: I am up to my neck in labours and worries.

As I told you I would follow your advice in re the Mackal book review. I will write it for you. As Ron generously offers to translate it rather than just edit it, it will be easier for me to write it, with all the needed finesse, in French, and this will save some time. All the same, I will send Ron my review as soon as I can, which I hope will be "soon". Of course I would not think of writing this review under a pseudonym: it would be a piece of cowardice.

Feel free to send an advance copy of my review to Mackal, but only if this is a rule for your journal: did you similarly act this way with von Däniken, L. Ron Hubbard and Uri Geller?

* *
*

I do understand that you regret not having met Ivan Sanderson. He was indeed an extraordinary person. In spite of some of his shortcomings - his propensity to exaggeration, his authoritarian manners and his refusal of all objections - he was

an over-gifted fellow, intelligent, brilliant (with streaks of genius), charming and witty. I liked him very much. And should I ever have been asked to write an article for the Reader's Digest in the series "The most extraordinary man I ever met" I would probably have chosen him.

* *
*

Concerning "deviant sciences", I quite agree with you that our problems are primarily "semantic".

I must say I do not understand very well your typology of sciences, possibly because I am not very familiar with the vocabulary of philosophy in English. I will wait until you send me a copy of your article before trying and comment it.

All the same, do you not think that by labelling certain claims "alleged anomalies" you already judge them subjectively? Are not all claims based on alleged facts? I think it is much easier to differentiate between what is simply "unexplained" and what is "unexplainable" (in the present state of our knowledge).

I think finally that the categorizing of sciences as proto-, crypto-, para- and normal science should not be based upon their objects, but only upon their methodology. It is in the way he investigates any problem that one can recognize the true scientist, the para-scientist (he who tries to delve into the unknown by methods alien to rational Science) and the pseudo-scientist.

Incidentally when you wrote "a crypto-science claim (in this case cryptozoological)" I appreciate it that you did

not use a hyphen in the latter word. This is the first point I made in my article on Cryptozoology (I sent the first draft of it to Ron): cryptozoology should not be considered as a cryptic form of zoology: it is just the "science of hidden animals", as paleontology is "the science of ancient beings" and paleozoology "the science of ancient animals" (an not an ancient, obsolete form of zoology!).

May I say also that your example of the mermaid is not very well chosen. The existence of some unknown species of primate adapted to life in the sea (even with scales on the lower part of the body: pangolins are mammals with scales) is not quite impossible, and not even highly improbable. I would rather take the Centaur as example, since a six-legged mammal is so highly improbable that one may consider it as impossible.

As you put it "the whole analysis is much more complicated", but it is essential. This is why I think that all your attempts, and Ron's, to clarify the many points related to the "claims of the Paranormal" are of utmost importance for the future of Science.

Please give Sterling my kindest regards when you see (or phone) him.

Very best wishes,

Bernard

[Bernard Heuvelmans]